The Oxnam Affair: Protestantism *Is* Subversive, See Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. I NUMBER 28 AUGUST 1, 1953 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Now The UN Must Liberate The USA

With the signing of a truce in Korea, the main political task of the UN in a sense must be the liberation of the USA. There can be no independent Korea until the United States has regained its own independence of all those forces symbolized and mobilized by the China Lobby. It will be difficult to unify Korea until some progress has been made in unifying the United States. More serious than the 38th parallel across Korea is the wall of paranoid suspicion crypto-Fascist forces here have been erecting around and across the United States, dividing Americans from each other and the rest of the world.

The Korean war would have been avoided if the UN had resisted pressure from Syngman Rhee and John Foster Dulles for the creation of a separate State in South Korea. The war with China might have been avoided if the UN in the winter of 1949-50 had rescued Acheson and Truman from imprisonment by the China Lobby and insisted on the admission of Communist China to the UN. The task now is harder, the danger greater. The problem now is to avoid World War III. The principal beneficiaries of the Korean war, Syngman Rhee and Chiang Kai-shek, are determined to see it resumed on a larger scale than ever, for if the truce becomes a peace neither can survive as a political force. In a peaceful world, recognition of Communist China is inevitable. It took martial law to ensure Rhee's reelection as President last year; he cannot hope to survive in a unified Korea, unless indeed it is unified for him by American arms and his government is given the means to fasten the same kind of police state on North Korea that Rhee rules in the South.

The key to a settlement in the East is unification of Korea, as the key to settlement in Europe is the unification of Germany but in both areas neither of the two contending great Powers has been willing to let go of its own satellite share for fear the other's bloc might get the whole of it. Both have been agreed on unification in principle but both in practice have appended conditions unacceptable to the other. One way out for the U.S. would be to offer to withdraw from Korea altogether and hand over the problem of unification to the neutral Asian powers, if the Russians and Chinese would do the same. Such a move would create much good will for the U.S. and wipe out entirely the ugly effect of the "let Asians fight Asians" slogan, which translated itself too easily into using colonial colored peoples as cannon fodder against those who had won their independence. An offer of the kind suggested here would imply a sort of Monroe Doctrine for Asia and create the cement necessary to hold the area together as an independent bloc between the Powers. But such bold and creative diplomacy seems to be made impossible by the obsessions of containment, and the political comfort of a mulishly inert diplomacy.

Now if ever is the time for the smaller powers to use their UN leverage creatively. They have much to learn from the Korean war. Korea was a terrible object lesson for all countries and areas which allow themselves to be divided between the American and the Russian power. The war showed that the American people, though instinctively kind and generous in dealing with distress, may easily be doped and duped by military leadership into permitting the kind of unnecessary havoc our Air Force wreaked in many parts of Korea. The war also showed that the American Air Force is infested with publicity men who are among the world's biggest liars; their inflated figures and inflammatory reporting are a menace. The war demonstrated again the delusion of victory by airpower and firepower, the ability of colonial colored peoples to handle jet planes and anti-aircraft radar effectively, the tremendous military power of the new China, and the willingness of the Chinese and the Russians to swallow one provocation after another in their desire for peace.

In this picture, the American people seem a passive mass. The military have been able to drag out the truce talks by one phoney issue after another for many months without popular protest in this country. The desire for peace is there, but the thought control drive has succeeded in stifling the forces and organizations which would have given it expression. The fear that peace might mean loss of jobs and business has been a potent factor, too, affecting workers as much as their employers. Militant rightist minorities easily sway this sheeplike mass, and cut down sharply the political and diplomatic maneuverability of the Eisenhower Administration. The new President promised peace in Korea and has fulfilled his promise, but the achievement of a precarious truce seems to have just about exhausted the political potency of the new Administration. Eisenhower's own desire for peace is a positive factor, but as against this the promise to walk out of a political conference after 90 days gives tremendous power for evil to Rhee and the American military men behind him.

Were there a peace movement left in this country, two of its main objectives in the crucial six months ahead would be clear. One would be to restore greater political freedom in South Korea so that peace forces there could provide some check on Syngman Rhee. The other would to be focus the spotlight on the coming Rhee-Dulles talks. These two Catos were among the chief architects of the war. The key point to watch are the conditions to which Rhee will try to commit the United States for unification of Korea. His own conditions require unconditional surrender, and that way lies resumption of the war.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Oxnam Affair: Protestantism Is Subversive

When a Bishop appears before the House Un-American Activities Committee to deny that he is a Communist, the spectacle is not conducive to political sanity. Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam's valor in appearing before the Committee was better than his judgment. His intentions were good. His appearance was a mistake.

The Bishop's purpose was not merely to clear his name but to expose the methods by which the Committee assembles its one-sided dossiers and distributes its unverified slanders. But the disorderly procedure of the Committee made it possible to bury his replies in irrelevant digressions. The Bishop's supporters will feel vindicated by the final resolution declaring that he is not a Communist. (The meek gratitude with which this monumental bit of cheek was accepted tells a tragic-comic story about present-day America.) The Bishop's detractors will be encouraged to go on with their stale libels by Congressman Walter's ugly postscript, "I don't know why anyone would say he was cleared, because no one ever charged him with anything." The Committee's ranking Democrat gave the cue to the anti-Oxnam pack when he insisted the Communists made dupes of many high placed persons and "I place Bishop Oxnam . . . in this category."

For this unsatisfactory verdict, the good Bishop paid a heavy price. He has opened doors the Committee did not quite dare open on its own. Chairman Velde created an uproar among his Congressional colleagues by suggesting that the Un-American Activities Committee might investigate the Churches. McCarthy was forced to get rid of J. B. Matthews as research director because the latter had questioned the loyalty of Protestant ministers.

At such a time, the House Committee would never have dared subpoena a Bishop of the Methodist Church, largest Protestant denomination in this country. Bishop Oxnam, by asking to be heard, gave the witch hunters an excuse to do under the guise of fairness what they had been itching to do all along. The Bishop also gave Velde and Kit Clardy an excuse to dig up three ex-Communists of ancient vintage, Gitlow, Kornfeder and Manning, exhausted lemons from which there is little left to squeeze, and ask them in executive session about Reds among the clergy. They "exposed" familiar targets—the Methodist Federation for Social Service, and two men long associated with it, the venerable Dr. Harry F. Ward and the long-harried Rev. Jack R. McMichael.

The testimony of the ex-Communists was used to draw the Bishop into "putting the finger" on his old friend, Dr. Ward, and on the Rev. McMichael. To discuss them and their views before the House Committee was improper. In effect the Bishop was led into smearing them in order to clear himself. He was not discussing political and doctrinal differences before men of honor and good-will. He was throwing two other Methodists to the wolves and opening his whole church to smear treatment via another "exposure" of its unofficial Left wing, the Methodist Federation for Social Service. The result was to "prove" through the Bishop himself that there had been "infiltration" by "subversives." This gives the witch hunt open sesame to the pulpit.

The hunt for radicals in the Church is logical if one keeps in mind the basic purpose of the witch hunt. It is no accident that Bishop Oxnam's grilling touched on his past criticism of the free enterprise system. The witch hunt is more concerned with doctrinal fidelity to Mammon than to God. America is to be made unsafe for social criticism and nonconformity. The Chamber of Commerce crowd still remembers what the Churches and indeed Dr. Ward himself did to the 12-hour day in steel after the 1919 steel strike seemed to have been safely smashed. Nor has that crowd forgotten what part such groups as the Methodist Federation played in helping the New Deal in the 30's.

The Churches, especially the Protestant Churches, could not hope for exemption from the thought control drive. Though Marx called religion the opiate of the people, the possessing classes have always feared that it might turn into a heady wine. It has never been easy to equate capitalism with the Brotherhood of Man. A religious system like Protestantism which glorifies individual judgment and conscience encourages "error" and "subversive" ideas. Ever since Protestantism and its forerunners unchained and translated the Bible, making it available to the common man, revolutionary lessons have been drawn from it. The communistic Anabaptists and the socialist Levellers testify to the inflammatory radicalism which may be distilled from Holy Writ. Men like Dr. Ward and the Rev. McMichael were in a familiar tradition if indeed they found Marx's "materialism" closer to Jesus and the Hebrew Prophets than the spiritual pretensions of a system which has its apex in the Chase National Bank.

Such deviations into fields closely akin to the communism of primitive Christianity are natural in the loose confines of an unpoliced system like Protestantism. This is the reality behind the convergent attacks upon it. J. B. Matthews paints the Protestant clergy as the largest single support of Communism in this country. Conversely Cardinal Ottaviani in Rome upholds restrictions against Protestant missionaries by declaring they find their "strongest allies and supporters among the Communists." The authoritarians of the right fear the freedom of opinion which is at the basis of Protestantism. It cannot submit to the witch hunt without losing its spiritual essence and abdicating to its ancient enemies. As seen from Rome, Protestantism *is* "subversive." When it ceases to be "subversive," it will cease to be Protestant.

The answer to the witch hunt in the Churches is that the Constitution says Congress shall make no establishment of religion. Church and State are separate, and Congress—unlike Parliament—may declare no doctrine orthodox. To inquire into the political beliefs of Churchmen is to plunge into a doctrinal controversy. Roman Catholicism and Fundamentalist Protestantism regard Liberal Theology as a breeding ground of political radicalism. To extend the Inquisition into the Churches is to turn the clock back three centuries to just such a situation as that from which the Pilgrims first fled, to link theological heresy again with political subversion, and to make the State the policeman of the Church. The only firm ground of defense is to deny the right of Congress to inquire into opinion, theological or otherwise. Ideas are no concern of the State in a free society. These premises Bishop Oxnam abandoned.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I. F. Stone's Weekly

• *Editor and Publisher*, I. F. STONE

Published weekly except the last two weeks of August at Room 205, 301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. Subscription rates: Domestic, $5 a year; Canada, Mexico and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, $6; England and Continental Europe, $10 by 1st class mail, $15 by air; for Israel, Asia, Australia and Africa, $10 by first class mail, $20 by air mail. Single copy, 15 cents. Tel.: LI 4-7087. Entered as Second Class mail matter, Post Office, Washington, D. C.

August 1, 1953 — Vol. I., No. 28

COMMENT

Cheerful Note

None of our readers will be unduly depressed to learn that thanks to the penny-pinching habits of those money-grubbing Republicans, the Department of Justice is being forced to abandon detention camps it had ready for "subversives" under the McCarran Internal Security Act of 1950.

The news was tucked away unnoticed in the recent testimony of James V. Bennett, Federal director of prisons, before the Senate appropriations Committee. "Two years ago, at the time the Internal Security Act was passed," Bennett explained, "we took over six surplus Army cantonments and began putting them in repair for possible use in the event of an emergency."

Under the detention camp provisions of the McCarran Act, subversives were to be thrown into camps in the event of war. Bennett said he had gotten some of the camps "fairly well in order" but that the reduction in estimates imposed by the economy minded Eisenhower Administration "will require the closing of at least half or perhaps all of these camps." Bennett added philosophically, "Perhaps the need for these camps may be fading into the distance a little."

Deportations Delirium

The shocking arrest for deportation of Jacob Burck, the brilliant Pulitzer Prize winning cartoonist of the Chicago Sun-Times, because he was once a radical, may serve to remind us that we are in the midst of a deportations delirium, quieter but much more extensive than that which followed World War I. Some figures on this were also provided by the Senate Appropriations Committee hearings.

There are now, thanks to the McCarran-Walter Act, "some 700 grounds" for deportation. At the end of the fiscal year, there were more than 11,000 persons being investigated for deportation as subversive, "more than double the figure of 4,500 such cases" pending at the close of the previous fiscal year. There were also in excess of 4,000 persons ordered deported to countries which would not take them. But a Mr. Kelly of the Immigration Service testified that progress was being made in forcing them to leave "by reason of the—I don't like to use the word harass—compulsion that we were able to put on them by keeping them in detention."

The following humane colloquy took place at this point:

Senator ELLENDER. Is there anything under the law you can do so aggravating that they want to leave the country?

Mr. KELLY. As I say, we have done that.

Senator ELLENDER. What is it?

Mr. KELLY. By invoking the provisions.

Senator ELLENDER. Can you not jail them?

Mr. KELLY. We are holding them in detention.

Senator ELLENDER. I thought this new act would give you full power to make conditions so distasteful that they would not want to live in the United States. I would sure try it.

Without Hobgoblins

Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson, when he said the Russian air force was largely defensive, was treated as one treats children who do not know better than to use certain words in the front parlor. But General Alfred M. Gruenther, Supreme Commander of NATO, a General who seems to operate without benefit of hobgoblins, gave much the same estimate in his Senate Appropriations Committee testimony.

When Senator Robertson (D. Va.) asked General Gruenther how the Soviet air force compared with ours, this much of the reply was left in the heavily censored record: "The Soviets have three main types of missions for their air force," Gruenther said. "One is interceptor or air defense, the second is long range strategic air, and the third is ground support planes. The long-range strategic airplanes are the B-29 type which is an obsolescent type so far as we are concerned." At that point the discussion went off the record.

The General also said (1) that the Russian ground forces of 175 divisions "is substantially the same as the Russians had four years ago" (2) that a sizeable portion of this force must be kept in the Far East and cannot be deployed in Europe and (3) "I do not think war is ever going to come." General Gruenther, who deserves an award of some kind for plain speaking, said he thought the danger lay not in war but in efforts to divide the NATO forces.

That is something Washington often does more effectively than Moscow.

Bulletin

The McCarran "immunity bath" bill to get rid of the Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination seemed safely bottled up in House Judiciary committee as we went to press. It has not yet been referred to a subcommittee and if Congress adjourns soon, as expected, will be dead for the session. Our hat is off to the many live wires among our readers who pitched in on this fight. It is important to build up greater awareness of this measure, since McCarran will certainly introduce it again next session.

Asleep at The Switch

S. R. 147, citing Harvey O'Connor for contempt, was called up by Majority Leader Knowland in the Senate on Thursday, July 23, and passed without a voice being raised in protest, without discussion, without a record vote and without a single "nay."

O'Connor, as our readers know, took the "Einstein pledge" position before McCarthy, refusing to invoke the Fifth Amendment but declining to answer all questions as to his political beliefs and associations. He challenged McCarthy's authority to ask such questions under the First Amendment and under the powers conferred on his investigating committee by the Senate rules as enacted in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Exactly ten days before the contempt resolution came up, Senator Mike Monroney (D. Okla.), in an attack on McCarthy also argued that he was exceeding his lawful authority (full text printed in our last issue) under the same statute.

Yet neither Senator Monroney nor Senator Lehman nor any of the liberal Senators who have been fighting McCarthy raised a voice in defense of O'Connor nor sought to have the contempt resolution reconsidered, as it might have been, on the two legislative days following.

Nor were the Senators the only people asleep at the switch. The newspapers fighting McCarthyism have been silent. The New Republic has not even mentioned O'Connor's fundamental defiance of McCarthy. Yet if as we believe and Senator Monroney believes, McCarthy has no lawful authority to inquire into opinion, then the issue should have been debated before the contempt resolution was passed by the Senate.

Millions of words have been written on how to fight McCarthyism, but when one brave American like O'Connor risks going to jail in order to challenge McCarthy's authority under the Senate's own rules and under the First Amendment, remarkably little interest is shown by the liberal press. Yet if the O'Connor case is won, as it can be won, a real blow will have been struck at McCarthy.

The author of "Mellon's Millions" lives at Little Compton, R. I. We urge all readers to write O'Connor and to line up all the support they can.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

JENNINGS PERRY'S PAGE

Times Mend, the Witch Doctors Sit Shakily

It seems to me that for a people who always have admired forthrightness in international communications we have become distressingly coquettish and that somewhere along the way in the past decade we have shamefully shuffled off both our "passion for knowledge" where the public affairs are concerned and the good democratic arrogance which used to prompt each of us to "have his idea" and to "speak his piece." For some reason our leaders actually appear to be afraid of face to face talks with the leaders of other countries with which we maintain differences; such interviews are not sought but are avoided from month to month and from year to year. What could we be afraid of: of being out-talked, of being taken in by the tricks of language, of fatal exasperation, of losing our temper and rushing into combat?

It was rather understandable in Mr. Truman's time. Our President then bravely went and sat in his place at the big conference table—because his predecessor had. He went only once, and painfully discovered that the world is large and that history is long and full of end results doubly confusing to one who before he became President was notoriously a poor scholar. Mr. Truman found it easier to pontificate from Washington than at distant tables to gnaw at problems rooted in causes old and hardy even before Columbus.

But Mr. Eisenhower, now, had been around. He knew that peoples in different lands spoke different tongues. He had met his opposite numbers in all kinds of uniforms and, suavely but trenchantly, had uncovered the common interest in the thickets of misunderstanding. The American people had expected him to be their capable and willing spokesman among the spokesmen of other peoples, to sit down and "talk sense" as man to man with other men in high places presumably as aware as he himself that "All wars are stupid." Thus far, his countrymen have waited in vain for the fulfilment of their hopes in the hero who could "talk to anybody anywhere" and have had increasingly to share with everybody everywhere the want of top level parleys for which the time is never "ripe."

With one of the great peoples who share the globe with us, the Chinese, with whom we have been at war, we will not speak at all. Surely nothing in our times is more fantastic than the pretense, which is our national policy, that the government of these people does not exist or at any rate that it is beneath our dignity to recognize its existence, now or ever. Over and over again, our Mr. Dulles is required to disclaim any plan for passing so much as the time of day with the government of the Chinese. The tabu is sheepishly bowed to by almost all of the members of our Congress. Yet no amount of ritualistic auto-suggestion can persuade us for long that what we see is not there, and nothing really comes of our strained and supercillious ignorance of China but peptic ulcers in our national colon. Nobody else is fooled, and we do not in fact fool ourselves.

I say that when we were healthier in our minds, when we stubbornly insisted upon facts instead of fairytales, the American people would not have permitted themselves to be put off or put upon by these arrant make believes. We should not have needed to be told by someone "in authority" that one day but not now it might be safe to risk frank discussions with "the Kremlin" on the common problem of building more bread instead of more bombs, or that "Peking" after all does have a form and a soul worth considering human.

I say that when we regain the health of our minds, as people sincerely dedicated to the proposition that all men (not just certain superpatriots) were created equal, we will not need to wait for Bishop Oxnams to assert our right to think and to speak. That we will not wait for the Cloth to run interference for our secular say-soing. And that in mid-Twentieth Century we will brush aside the silly efforts to impose orthodoxy upon our seeing, thinking and speaking as sturdily as we were used to doing from the beginning of our nation up to only a time not long ago we all can recall.

"Democracies move slowly." But the deep roots of our genius are in our ability, after a time of panic, to become disgusted with our aberration, to reject the dictates of any judgment but our own. We the people are feeling a little more assertive now. The new witch doctors sit shakily. If we do not soon find fearless spokesmen, we should recapture the self-confidence to speak sense back to and over the heads of our censors and weakling wizards.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 8-1-53
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Please enter the following subscription. $5 for 1 year is enclosed. (See page 3 for foreign rates)

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....

State .....

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E.,
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Post Office
Washington, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED